

REMARKS

Claims 3-11, 14-19, 21-31, 38-39, 41-42, and 46-51 are pending. By this amendment, claims 3-11, 14-19, 21-31, 38-39, 41-42, and 46-51 are amended, and claims 1-2, 12-13, 20, 32-37, 40, and 43-45 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 49-51 are added. For the reasons set forth below, Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application.

I. Double Patenting

Claims 1-48 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,298,126. As discussed above, claims 1-2, 13, 20, 32-37, 40, and 43-45 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. To the extent the rejection applies to the remaining claims, it is respectfully traversed.

A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Assignee regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation “said call” in claim 21 and insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation “OSPS” in claim 22. Claims 21-22 are amended to cure the antecedent basis issues highlighted by the Office Action. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Assignee thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 23-24 are allowed. In addition, claims 21-22 are indicated as allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth by the Office Action. As discussed above, claims 21-22 are amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claims 21-22 are allowable.

The Office Action further indicates that claims 3, 7, 14, 18, 41, and 48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the recitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 3, 7, 14, 18, 41, and 48 are rewritten in independent form including all of the recitations of each claims base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, claims 3, 7, 14, 18, 41, and 48 are allowable as are the dependent claims depending from these independent claims.

Finally, the Office Action indicates that claims 28-31 would be allowable if a terminal disclaimer set forth in the Office Action is filed to overcome the double patenting rejection. As indicated above, a terminal disclaimer is provided herewith. Accordingly, claims 28-31 are allowable.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 12, 20, 32, 33, 36, 37, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,191,860 to Weber (hereinafter “Weber”). As discussed above, claims 1, 12, 20, 32-37, and 43-44 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Le and Neville

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 12, 16, 20, 31, 32, 36 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,924,510 to Le (hereinafter “Le”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,588,048 to Neville (hereinafter “Neville”). As discussed above, claims 1, 12, 20, 32, 36, and 43 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot with regards to claims 1, 12, 20, 32, 36, and 43. To the extent the rejection applies to the remaining claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-6, 9, 16, and 31 are amended to depend from claims indicated by the Office Action as allowable. Thus, claims 5-6, 9, 16, and 31 are also allowable. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

VI. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Weber and Karras

Claims 2, 13, 34 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,438,570 to Karras et al. (hereinafter “Karras”). As discussed

above, claims 2, 13, and 34 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot with regards to claims 2, 13, and 34. To the extent the rejection applies to the remaining claim, it is respectfully traversed.

Claim 38 is amended to depend from a claim indicated by the Office Action as allowable. Thus, 38 is also allowable. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

VII. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Weber and Lev

Claims 4, 15, 35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,327 to Lev et al. (hereinafter “Lev”). As discussed above, claim 35 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot with regards to claim 35. To the extent the rejection applies to the remaining claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4, 15, and 39 are amended to depend from claims indicated by the Office Action as allowable. Thus, claims 4, 15, and 39 are also allowable. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

VIII. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Le, Neville, and Benyacar

Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Le in view of Neville and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,003,584 to Benyacar et al. (hereinafter “Benyacar”). Claims 8 and 19 are amended to depend from claims indicated by the Office Action as allowable. Thus, claims 8 and 19 are also allowable. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IX. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Le, Neville, and Levy

Claims 10-11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Le in view of Neville and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,291,550 to Levy et al. (hereinafter “Levy”). Claims 10-11 and 17 are amended to depend from claims indicated by the Office Action as allowable. Thus, claims 10-11 and 17 are also allowable. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

X. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Weber and Penzias

Claims 40 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,515,425 to Penzias et al. (hereinafter "Penzias"). As discussed above, claims 40 and 45 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot with regards to claims 40 and 45. To the extent the rejection applies to the remaining claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Claims 46-47 are amended to depend from claims indicated by the Office Action as allowable. Thus, claims 46-47 are also allowable. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

XI. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Weber and Benyacar

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Benyacar. Claim 42 is amended to depend from a claim indicated by the Office Action as allowable. Thus, claim 42 is also allowable. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

XII. New Claims 49-51

New claims 49, 50, and 51 recite additional features set forth in the specification of the current application. New claims 49, 50, and 51 include recitations similar to recitations set forth in original claims 7, 16, and 18, respectfully. New claims 49, 50, and 51 are allowable over the cited art because they depend from claims indicated as allowable by the Office Action. Accordingly, these claims should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact Assignee's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

/Jodi L. Hartman/

Date: October 18, 2011

Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251

AT&T Legal Department
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, New Jersey 07921

82866

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE